

REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Letter mailed in the above-referenced case on December 27, 2005. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-11 and 13-20 are standing for examination. Claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 9 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-11 and 13-19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burson et al. (US 6,4058,245) hereinafter Burson, and claim 20 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burson in view of Thompson et al. (US 6,571,253) hereinafter Thompson.

Applicant has again carefully noted and reviewed the Examiner's rejections, references and comments. In response applicant amends the claims to more clearly and particularly recite the automation of the navigation and user registration actions performed by the system. Applicant provides further arguments to more particularly point out the patentable subject matter of the claimed invention. Claim 1 is herein added.

Regarding the 112 rejections the Examiner states that the "normal" functions of a navigation sequence are not described in the specification, or recited in the body of the claims in such a manner to enable one with skill in the art to make and/or use the invention. Applicant herein amends the independent claims to recite what is specifically included in the "navigation sequence". Applicant's claims now recite performing normal user navigation and registration actions automatically and transparent to the user including navigation to Web sites, registration with a user name and password, form filling, data searching, parsing Web pages and data capture and return. Applicant believes the claims, as amended are supported in an enabling manner in applicant's specification. Therefore, the 112 rejection should be withdrawn.

Regarding the 103 rejection relying upon the art of Burson, applicant believes the independent claims, as amended, also overcome said rejection. Applicant points out that Burson cannot perform all of the functions of applicant's software bundle and method, as claimed.

Burson teaches that a failed registration could result from several situations. First, the end user attempting to register with the PT provider does not qualify for registration; for example, an end user attempting to register with a bank with whom the end user 50 does not maintain an account and where the bank only allows access to account holders. Next, the end user may have supplied improper or incorrect information. For example, a bank registration process might require a social security number, a password, a bank account number and the maiden name of the end user's mother; if the user entered an incorrect social security number, the registration process would fail. Finally, the PT provider may have altered the registration procedure for its Web site. In this situation, following the process supplied from the Provider store 320 would yield a failed registration. In the instance of any registration failure, the end user could be presented with the data initially supplied to the system for registration. The system could then ask the end user to double check the correctness of the information provided and to correct and resubmit the data if an error is found. A second failure resulting from the submission of identical requisite data might generate an error message presented to the end user (Column 8, line 46 to column 9, line 6).

Applicant teaches and claims the ability for an automatic navigation sequence to perform navigation to Web sites, registration with a user name and password, form filling, data searching, parsing Web pages and data capture and return. Burson fails to teach the ability to truly auto register the user and search and parse Web sites. With the automatic search and parse functions, corrections

are automatically made when registrations fails to avoid failed registration messages from the browser/Web site. Applicant argues a user whom was manually navigating would be able to correct for instances when the Web site changes formats. Applicant's invention also teaches and claims said ability. Applicant argues that Burson fails to teach a browser application performing said claimed functions above.

Applicant also argues that the PI provider Web sites, as disclosed in Burson, are manually configured wherein templates and PIC files are stored for each provider. Applicant argues that Burson teaches away from the API's as disclosed and claimed in applicant's invention because the functions of applicant's API's are not needed in Burson as Burson does not need to integrate with external sources as claimed in applicant's **invention in order to perform full automation**. The Examiner states that Burson teaches that the set of machine readable instructions is provided from an external source, other than the control application relying on Burson's teachings in col. 4 line 66 to col. 5, line 21, reciting that additional procedures necessary to complete a transaction may be stored within the PI store. Applicant argues that the PI store of Burson is within the control application and *not* external to the control application as claimed.

Applicant argues the main goal of the present invention is to provide a fully functional and truly automated navigation system that may be spawned and executed to completion based on machine-readable instruction. Burson fails to teach or suggest the advanced automated browsing and data collection process of applicant's invention.

In view of the above claim amendments and arguments presented by applicant the prior art references now clearly fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of applicant's independent claims as amended. Depending claims 2, 4-7, 9, 11 and 13-20 are then patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from

a patentable claim. It is therefore respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed quickly to issue.

If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Juei Chang et al.

By *Donald R. Boys*
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457